

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 26, 2004, restriction was required to one of the following groups:

- I. Claim 1, drawn to a system for mail processing, classified in class 700, subclass 227;
- II. Claims 2-9, drawn to a method for mail processing, classified in class 700, subclass 226;
- III. Claims 10 and 12, drawn to a method of sorting mail pieces, classified in class 700, subclass 224; and
- IV. Claim 11, drawn to a method of processing a series of articles, classified in class 700, subclass 213.

Applicant has canceled claims 1-10 and 12 and added new claims 13-31. Applicant elects with traverse group IV, claim 11. It is believed that the number of groups as stated above is incorrect because the examiner is focusing too much on slight differences in wording in the preambles of the original independent claims. However, to expedite the prosecution, amendments have been made to reduce the number of independent claims presented.

Claims 13-23 depend from claim 11. New claim 24 is a linking apparatus claim in means-plus-function format that should be examined together with claim 11. See MPEP 809.03(c).

Claims 25-31 depend from claim 24.

With respect to the election of species requirement, Applicants elect Species I, where the imager is a hand held capture device. All of the claims are readable on the elected species.

It is believed that no additional fee is due. If this is incorrect, the Commissioner is

hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-1588.

Respectfully submitted,



Philip G. Meyers
Reg. No. 30,478

Date: November 24, 2004

PHILIP G. MEYERS LAW OFFICE
1009 Long Prairie Road, Suite 302
Flower Mound, Texas 75022
(972) 874-2852
(972) 874-2983 (Fax)